

Response to Comments]Pauer response / PEvans comment April 5, 2001 Comments

Pam,

I've just received your comments, which were sent to the Lab last month. Here are my responses to each:

1. I appreciated Owen Hoffman's explanation of the air modeling results and how these exercises affected the redeployment of air monitoring station around the NTLF.

Thanks. A lot of work went into this project. It's good to know that it's appreciated.

2. I support Michael Rochette's request (Regional Water Quality Control Board representative) that the groundwater pathway be evaluated either as part of the HRS process or supplementary to it.

Noted; however, your comments should also be directed to EPA since they prepare the HRS.

3. I also support Mr. Rochette's request that the RWQCB be kept closely informed regarding the removal of the hillside stack and the associated exhaust system, as well as any contaminant investigation and clean up that occurs as a result.

We agree. In fact, we've met with Michael twice recently to provide him information about the removal of the hillside stack. We routinely meet with Michael on a quarterly basis to discuss contaminant investigation and clean up work. In addition, work plans for these activities are prepared by the Lab and submitted to the RWQCB for their approval.

4. I am requesting that LBNL work with members of the task force to quickly resolve how information about the timing of tritiation work can be made available in such a way that it can be correlated to stack emissions and other environmental sampling data.

We plan to provide information about NTLF tritiation work and its correlation with both stack emissions and other environmental sampling data with our evaluation, at the end of the process. Please remember that ambient air, the most important exposure pathway, will be sampled continuously over the entire project.

Hopefully, this addresses your comments. Let me know if you need more information.

